



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,172	01/14/2004	Nizar Alibhoy	PU050093	4824
24498 7590 05/03/2011 Robert D. Shedd, Patent Operations THOMSON Licensing LLC P.O. Box 5312 Princeton, NJ 08543-5312				
EXAMINER				
ONYEZIA, CHUKS N				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3691				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/03/2011		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/758,172

**Applicant(s)**

ALLIBHOY ET AL.

**Examiner**

CHUKS ONYEZIA

**Art Unit**

3691

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 July 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-945)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20110420
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. In the amendment filed 12/27/2010, the following has occurred: claim 1, has been amended. Claims 1-19 are currently presented and have been considered for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Examiner notes the amendments to claims but the claims still fail to meet the above requirements because the steps are neither tied to machine (such as a particular apparatus) nor physically transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. Examiner finds that the recitation of "Database" and "network" can reasonably be interpreted as software, merely using paper and pen, or the human mind. In addition, examiner finds that the recitation of "user receiver" fails to tie a machine to a critical step because the "user receiver" is being relied on to merely for selection of transaction.

Art Unit: 3691

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. Withdrawn.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1-5, 7-9, and 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dejaeger, U.S. Patent No. 6,296,185 B1 (PTO-892 Reference A) in view of Payton U.S. Patent No. 5,790,935 (PTO-892 Reference C).**

7. As per claim 1, Dejaeger teaches a method of tracking at least one financial transaction between a user receiver and at least one content provider which transmits on-demand content to the user receiver by a network, wherein the tracking method is performed by a third party separate from the user receiver and separate from the at least one content provider, the method comprising the steps of:

a. storing preliminary information said at least one financial transactions in a third party controlled data

Art Unit: 3691

base operated by a network operator that is said third party and said network between said at least one content provider and said user receiver (see column 34 lines 44-58 and column 14 lines 55-65) examiner interprets the "master database" as external and third party controlled as opposed to the "transaction level database" which is locally constructed;

b. obtaining supplemental information for said at least one financial transactions in said third party controlled data base, wherein said obtaining step is performed by the third party (column 34 lines 44-58);

c. storing said supplemental information for said at least one financial transactions in said third party controlled data base (column 34 lines 44-58);

d. displaying summary information for each of the plurality of financial transactions upon receipt of a display request from the user receiver, wherein said summary information is comprised of at least a portion of said stored preliminary information (column 16 lines 48-56) examiner interprets the users operation of the checkout system as a request;

e. permitting selection of one or more of the financial transactions from said at least one financial transaction

Art Unit: 3691

by the user receiver for finalization (column 10 lines 62-67);

f. finalizing said selected one or more financial transactions (column 11 lines 14-25); and

g. providing transaction finalization information to each of the at least one content providers affected by said selected one or more financial transactions wherein content corresponding to each of said selected one or more financial transactions is authorized to be transmitted to said user receiver by said at least content providers affected by said selected one or more financial transactions. (column 27 lines 25-32).

However, Dejaeger does not explicitly disclose the request being for "on-demand content". Payton discloses a system that receives a subscribers request for on-demand content (see Payton Fig 3b). It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Dejaeger with those of Payton for the purpose of broadening the types of goods and services that are allowed to be purchased.

8. As per claim 2, Dejaeger teaches the above limitations of claim 1. Dejaeger further teaches the step of displaying at least one advertisement simultaneously with said summary information (column 59 lines 47-65).

9. As per claim 3, Dejaeger teaches the above limitations of claim 2. Dejaeger further teaches said at least one advertisement includes linking information to a specific content provider (column 59 lines 47-65).

10. As per claim 4, Dejaeger teaches the above limitations of claim 1. Dejaeger further teaches said summary information is comprised of purchase tracking information (column 16 lines 48-56).

11. As per claim 5, Dejaeger teaches the above limitations of claim 1. Dejaeger further teaches said summary information is comprised of purchase status information (column 16 lines 48-56).

12. As per claim 7, Dejaeger teaches the above limitations of claim 1. Dejaeger further teaches said finalizing step is further comprised of the step of displaying at least one checkout display screen (column 16 lines 48-56).

13. As per claim 8, Dejaeger teaches the above limitations of claim 7. Dejaeger further teaches the step of displaying at least one advertisement simultaneously with said at least one checkout display screen (column 59 lines 47-65).

14. As per claim 9, Dejaeger teaches the above limitations of claim 8. Dejaeger further teaches said at least one advertisement includes linking information when selected by a

user allows said user to access a specific content provider (column 59 lines 47-65).

15. As per claim 12, Dejaeger teaches the above limitations of claim 1. Dejaeger further teaches the steps of: permitting selection of one or more of the financial transactions by the user receiver for additional information inquiry; obtaining said additional information for said selected financial transactions from said third party controlled data base; and displaying said additional information for said selected financial transactions (column 34 lines 44-58).

16. As per claim 13, Dejaeger teaches the above limitations of claim 1. Dejaeger further teaches the steps of: permitting selection of one or more of the financial transactions by the user receiver for additional information inquiry; obtaining said additional information for said selected financial transactions from the at least one content provider affected by said selected one or more financial transactions; and displaying said additional information for said selected financial transactions (column 34 lines 44-58).

17. As per claim 14, Dejaeger teaches the above limitations of claim 1. Dejaeger further teaches the step of finalizing said selected one or more financial transactions is performed by a network operator (column 34 lines 40-54).



18. As per claim 15, Dejaeger teaches the above limitations of claim 1. Dejaeger further teaches the step of charging each of the at least one content providers affected by said selected one or more financial transactions (column 26 lines 47-66).

19. As per claim 16, Dejaeger teaches the above limitations of claim 15. Dejaeger further teaches said charging step is performed by said network operator of said network (column 26 lines 47-66).

20. As per claim 17, Dejaeger teaches the above limitations of claim 15. Dejaeger further teaches said fee is based on a total number of finalized financial transactions (column 26 lines 47-66).

21. As per claim 18, Dejaeger teaches the above limitations of claim 15. Dejaeger further teaches said fee to a specific content provider of said at least one content providers is based on a total number of finalized financial transactions occurring between said user receiver and said specific content provider (column 26 lines 47-66).

22. As per claim 19, Dejaeger teaches the above limitations of claim 15. Dejaeger further teaches said fee is based on a cost associated with said finalized financial transactions (column 26 lines 47-66).

23. As per claim 6, Dejaeger teaches the above limitations of claim 1. Dejaeger further teaches the steps of: determining display capabilities for the user receiver; and matching a format, from a Plurality of formats, corresponding to said displayed summary information to said determined display capabilities (column 16 lines 48-56; the interactive customer interface terminal includes a display monitor which is provided to display retail information to the customer during operation of the checkout system. For example, transaction information such as item price, item description, total amount of the transaction, instructions, etcetera is displayed to the customer via the display monitor during operation of the checkout system in either its assisted mode of operation or its self-service mode of operation) examiner notes that a determination of display capabilities and matching format compatibilities is necessary in order to display such information.

while Dejaeger does not explicitly disclose the use of a Set top box as the user's receiver, Dejaeger discloses the use of a display monitor as the customer interface (column 16 lines 48-56; the interactive customer interface terminal includes a display monitor which is provided to display retail information to the customer during operation of the checkout system). Payton discloses the use of a subscriber's playback device being a

television, audio system, or computer (See Payton Col 4 Lns 50-54). It would have been obvious to exchange the checkout terminal of Dejaeger with the at home user POS display of Payton for the purpose of allowing flexibility of purchase locations.

24. As per claim 11, Dejaeger teaches the above limitations of claim 6. Dejaeger further teaches said displayed summary information utilizes only a portion of said determined display capabilities of the user receiver (See Figure 21).

**25. Claim 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dejaeger, U.S. Patent No. 6,296,185 B1 (PTO-892 Reference A) in view of Fields, U.S. Patent No. 4,400,724 (PTO-892 Reference B).**

26. As per claim 10, Dejaeger teaches the above limitations of claim 1. However Dejaeger does not teach said displayed summary information is displayed as a semi-transparent screen overlay. The Examiner notes, displaying information in this fashion does not modify the operation of Dejaeger's invention. To modify Dejaeger's display to include a semi-transparent screen overlay would have been obvious to the skilled artisan because the inclusion of such view would have been an obvious matter of design choice in light of the method already disclosed by Dejaeger (see Fields, column 11 lines 2-7). Such a modification would not have otherwise affected Dejaeger and would have merely

represented one of numerous views that the skilled artisan would have found obvious for the purposes of displaying multiple messages, already disclosed by Dejaeger. Additionally, applicant has not persuasively demonstrated the criticality of providing this arrangement versus the arrangement discloses in Dejaeger. See *In re Japikse*, 181 F.2d 1019, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950).

***Response to Arguments***

27. Applicant's arguments filed 12/27/2010 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

28. Applicant argues that:

Dejaeger does not disclose "Network operator".

Examiner responds that:

Applicant's argument has been considered but examiner notes that the recitation of "Network operator" as claimed is reasonable interpreted as a limitation that is directed to a human. However examiner relies on the scanning and post scanning area device of Dejaeger (Col 14 Lns 55-65) as the network operator.

29. Applicant argues that:

Dejaeger does not disclose "the delivery of on-demand programming".

Examiner responds that:

Applicant is correct. Dejaeger directly teaches a method of tracking financial transactions between user and merchant (see Dejaeger Col. 3 Lns. 19-32). Dejaeger does not explicitly disclose the request being for "on-demand content". Payton discloses a system that receives a subscribers request for on-demand content (see Payton Fig 3b). It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Dejaeger with those of Payton for the purpose of broadening the types of goods and services that are allowed to be purchased. All that is being done is applying the system of Dejaeger, and allowing for the purchase of 'on demand content' to be one of the underlying transactions.

30. Applicant argues that:

Relied on art does not teach "displaying summary information for each of the plurality of financial transactions upon receipt of a display request for on-demand content from a user receiver".

Examiner responds that:

In the invention of Dejaeger, a customer uses a point of sales terminal to execute financial transactions of desired goods and services and later provides summary information of each transaction in the form of a receipt. Examiner is noting that combining the checkout process with the on-demand purchases would be reasonable and would provide these limitations.

31. Applicant argues that:

Dejaeger does not disclose "third party controlled database".

Examiner responds that:

Dejaeger (column 14 lines 55-65) discloses 2 separately maintained databases that are utilized in the transaction process. Examiner interprets the "master database" as external and third party controlled as opposed to the "transaction level database" which is locally constructed.

32. Applicant argues that:

Dejaeger does not disclose "linking information for obtaining additional content from a specific content provider" as stated in claim 3.

Examiner responds that:

Dejaeger (column 59 lines 45-65) explicitly discloses the display of customer specific advertisement as response to transaction execution. Examiner reasonably views a product advertisement as "linking information" from a specific provider. Dejaeger further gives an example that a response to check out, a customer may be shown an advertisement for ACME BEER. This advertisement or the name alone would reasonably link the provider with the product/content.

33. Applicant argues that:

Dejaeger does not consider the display capabilities of the user receiver as it related to the format to be used.

Examiner responds that:

The displaying device of Dejaeger does in fact take into consideration the display format. Dejaeger discloses a display monitor that is provided for the user that is formatted to receive the desired display or advertisements.

***Conclusion***

34. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHUKS ONYEZIA whose telephone number is (571)270-1372. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. O./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3691

/Hani M. Kazimi/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3691